



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/221,542	12/28/1998	JACQUES JOSEPH LABRIE	ST9-98-004	4441

687 7590 02/12/2004

ALBERT P. SHARPE, III
FAY, SHARPE, BEALL, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 700
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

15

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/221,542

Applicant(s)

LABRIE, JACQUES JOSEPH

Examiner

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment filed on 01/27/2004 (paper # 14), the examiner agrees to withdraw the finality of the previous office action filed on 10/27/2003 based on applicant's arguments of U.S.C. 102(f) rejection.
2. Claims 1-28 remain for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sheard et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,208,345).

As to claim 7, Sheard et al. (hereinafter referred as Sheard) disclosed the invention as claimed including:

1) a computer having a memory and a data storage device coupled thereto that stores data; [e.g., the Data Store (64), Fig. 3];

2) one or more computer programs [e.g., the Visual Interface (61, Fig. 3), the Data Exchange Infrastructure (62, Fig. 3)], performed by the computer, for selecting a target object in an information catalog and providing information about a source from which the target object was derived [e.g. see the open menu processing, col. 22, lines 50-52; col. 23, lines 10-34; Fig. 17 - Fig. 19].

As to claim 8, Sheard further disclosed the target object is represented as a node in a tree structure [e.g. the tree view of Fig. 19; col. 24, lines 53-66].

As to claim 9, Sheard further disclosed the system having one or more computer programs including means for providing the transformation information of source to target [e.g., the transport framework architecture, col. 3, lines 51-59].

As to claim 10, Sheard further disclosed the system having means to identify a transformation producing function [e.g., the various meta-model conversion utilities, col. 31, lines 13-34].

As to claim 11, Sheard further disclosed the system having means for providing lineage information [e.g. the using of a mouse to draw an interconnections line between source and target of Fig. 20; col. 3, lines 27-29; the folder-style tabbing technique of Fig. 19, col. 26, lines 18-20.];

As to claim 12, Sheard further disclosed the system having means for maintaining transformation models for use in providing the lineage information [e.g., Fig. 5B; col. 11, lines 12-25].

As to claims 1-6, the steps in the claimed method are deemed to be made inherit by the functions of the apparatus structure in the combination discussed above, hence were rejected for the same reasons.

As to claims 13-18, these claims recite the same features as in claims 1-12 with a computer program product form. As the underlying process has been disclosed or fairly suggested by the teachings of Sheard, hence they were rejected for the same reasons giving above.

As to claim 28, Sheard further disclosed the system comprising:

a) a plurality of objects [e.g., the objects in Fig. 5B] including a target object wherein the target object was derived from one or more transformations of one or more sources data [e.g. col. 11, lines 26-42];

b) a user interface for receiving user input for selecting one of the plurality of objects [the Visual Interface (31), Fig. 1];

c) user interface configure to display the transformation lineage information in response to receiving user selected input [e.g., Fig(s). 17-24].

As to claim 27, this claim recites similar features as in claims 1-18 and 28 in form of a computer-readable medium having contents to perform data navigating. As the underlying process has been disclosed or fairly suggested by the teachings of Sheard, hence they were rejected for the same reasons giving above.

As to claims 1-7 and 19-26, the steps in the claimed method are deemed to be made inherit by the functions of the apparatus structure of claims 7-18 and 27-28, in the combination discussed above, hence were rejected for the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. To expedite the process of examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should

provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Applicant's amendment filed on 08/02/2003 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action, since applicant fails to defined the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter "content of" or "data", which triggers the examiner making different interpretations based on the new prior art each time when the claims were amended. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached at (703) 308-1436. The fax phone numbers for this group is: (703) 872-9306.

8. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Susan Chen

Feb. 7, 2004



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER